

REMARKS

This submission with RCE is in response to the Final Action mailed September 30, 2008.

Amendments to the claims

Claims 1-9 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-9 have been amended. The term “mobile storage device” has been changed to “removable storage device” for clarity only – it is believed that “removable” is a more accurate translation from the Chinese priority application and is supported by the present application in the example devices given. Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found, for example, in page 6, lines 1-2, and page 10, lines 16-26, of the application as originally filed. All amendments made herein are being made without prejudice.

35 USC 103

In the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-7 under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 5,400,389 to Niiyama (hereafter “Niiyama”) in view of U.S. Pat. Publ. 2002/0077094 to Leppanen (hereafter “Leppanen”). The Examiner further states that claims 8 and 9 are obvious over Niiyama in view of Leppanen and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,884,103 to Terho (hereafter “Terho”). Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended overcome these rejections.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “the operating system limits sending said commands to the removable storage device, said commands include a device control operation command corresponding to an operation that the operating system limits the removable storage device from performing.” Neither Niiyama nor Leppanen teach or suggest that their operating system “limits sending...a device control operation command corresponding to an operation that the operating system limits the removable storage device from performing.” The method of claim 1 allows the limited (i.e. blocked, restricted, etc.) device commands to be sent to removable storage devices by way of standard write

commands. One skilled in the art would not combine the teachings of Niiyama (a system for rewriting data in memory provided in a portable remote terminal) and Leppanen (a software loading method for mobile phones) to produce the claimed method.

Further, neither Niiyama nor Leppanen teach *“removable storage device being connected with said operating system via a universal interface”* as recited in claim 1. Niiyama teaches a terminal connected via a standard interface (e.g. RS-232C) (see Niiyama col. 5, lines 55-57). Leppanen teaches a mobile phone connected via the cell network (see Fig. 4, figure reference 410, of Leppanen).

The Applicant respectfully requests that the obviousness rejection against claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-9

Claims 2-9 are dependant claims of claim 1. Therefore, claims 2-9 are patentable at least for the reason that they are dependant claims that depend upon a patentable claim. The Applicant respectfully requests that the obviousness rejection against claims 2-9 be withdrawn.

* * * * *

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this RCE is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transferred to the USPTO via EFS on

December 30, 2008
(Date of Transmission)

Joanna Sosa
(Name of Person Transmitting)

/Joanna Sosa/
Signature

December 30, 2008
Date

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian J. Cash 60,546/
Brian J. Cash
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 60,546
LADAS & PARRY
5670 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 2100
Los Angeles, CA 90036
(323) 934-2300 voice
(323) 934-0202 fax
bcash@la.ladas.com